1 2 3 4 .5	DANIEL E. LUNGREN, Attorney General of the State of California JEANNE C. WERNER, [State Bar No. 931' Deputy Attorney General Department of Justice 2101 Webster Street, 12th Floor Oakland, California 94612-3049 Telephone: (510) 286-3787 Attorneys for Complainant	70]
7		·
8 9	BEFORE THE BOARD OF ACCOUNTANCY DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	In the Matter of the Accusation) Against:	NO. AC-96-10
12		
13	MARY M. LEAL P. O. Box 20068 San Jose, CA 95160	DEFAULT DECISION AND ORDER OF THE BOARD
14 15	Certified Public Accountant) Certificate No. CPA 35852,)	[Gov. Code § 11520]
16	Respondent.)	
17)	
18	STATUTES AND REGULATIONS	
19	1. The California State Board of Accountancy of the	
20	Department of Consumer Affairs ("Board") is authorized to revoke	
21	respondent's Certified Public Accountant Certificate pursuant to	
22	California Business and Professions Code section 5100, which	
23	provides that the Board may revoke, suspend or refuse to renew	
24	any permit or certificate issued by the Board.	
25	2. California Government Code section 11506(b)	
26	provides, in pertinent part, that the respondent shall be	
27	entitled to a hearing on the merits if she files a notice of	

* * *

03541110SF95AD1320 Case No. AC-96-10 Default Decision defense, and any such notice shall be deemed a specific denial of all parts of the accusation not expressly admitted. Failure to file such notice shall constitute a waiver of respondent's right to a hearing, but the agency in its discretion may nevertheless grant a hearing.

M. Waynes

The second second

- 3. California Government Code section 11520(a) provides, in pertinent part, that if the respondent fails to file a notice of defense or to appear at the hearing, the agency may take action based upon the respondent's express admissions or upon other evidence and affidavits may be used as evidence without any notice to respondent.
- 4. Business and Professions Code! section 5100 authorizes the Board to impose discipline upon a licensee based upon unprofessional conduct, including for the reasons specified therein as well as for violations of the Accountancy Act or the Board's rules and regulations.
- 5. Section 5050 provides that no person shall engage in the practice of public accountancy in California unless the person holds a valid permit to practice public accountancy issued by the Board. Section 5051 sets forth the definition of "public accountancy."
- 6. Section 5107 provides, in part, that the Board may request the administrative law judge, as part of the proposed decision in a disciplinary proceeding, to direct any holder of a permit or certificate found in violation of section 5100(c) to

^{1.} Every statutory reference hereinafter is to the Business and Professions Code unless otherwise stated.

pay to the Board all reasonable costs of investigation and prosecution of the case, including, but not limited to, attorney's fees.

Andrew State State

- 7. Under section 118, the suspension, expiration, or forfeiture by operation of law of a license issued by the Board, or its suspension, forfeiture, or cancellation by order of the Board or by order of a court of law, or its surrender without the written consent of the Board, shall not, during any period in which it may be renewed, restored, reissued, or reinstated, deprive the Board of its authority to institute or continue a disciplinary proceeding against the licensee upon any ground provided by law or to enter an order suspending or revoking the license or otherwise taking disciplinary action against the license on any such ground.
- 8. The Board's regulations, codified in Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations², require, in section 87(a) that a licensee complete at least 80 hours of qualifying continuing education during every two-year period immediately preceding permit renewal.

Board Rule 89(a) requires that a licensee submit, with a license renewal, a written statement, signed under penalty of perjury attesting to the completion of the requisite number of continuing education hours.

Board Rule 89(b) requires that a licensee, in order to

^{26 2.} The Board's rules, codified at Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations in sections 1-99, are here.

California Code of Regulations in sections 1-99, are hereinafter referred to as "Board Rule." Thus, section 89 is Board Rule 89.

receive continuing education credit for attending a continuing education course, obtain and retain for four years after renewal a certificate of completion or its equivalent signed by the course provider, disclosing required information set forth in the rule.

AND THE RESERVE OF THE PARTY OF

· ·

Board Rule 89(f) provides, with regard to continuing education, that a licensee's willful making of any false or misleading statement, in writing regarding his or her continuing education shall constitute cause for disciplinary action pursuant to Code section 5100(f) of the Accountancy Act.

Board Rule 89.1(a) provides that the Board may request licensees, selected on the basis of a statistical sampling, to supply copies of selected financial reports issued during the previous two years.

Board Rule 89.1(b) provides that the willful failure of a licensee to comply with the Board's written request for a copy of financial report(s), within 30 calendar days of the licensee's receipt of that request, constitutes a violation of section 5100(f) of the Accountancy Act.

Board Rule 90(a) provides that a renewal applicant may be granted either an extension of time to complete continuing education requirements or an exception from continuing education requirements, for the causes stated therein.

Board Rule 90(c) provides that the willful failure of a licensee to complete applicable continuing education within a specified extension of time shall constitute cause for disciplinary action pursuant to section 5100(f) of the

Accountancy Act.

1.5

JURISDICTION AND FINDINGS OF FACT

Pursuant to its authority under Government Code section 11520, and based on the evidence before it, the Board finds that the allegations contained in Accusation No. AC-96-10 are true. Specifically, the Board finds that:

The state of the s

9. On September 24, 1982, the Board issued Certified Public Accountant Certificate No. CPA 35852 to respondent. The certificate expired on December 1, 1992, and remained expired until it was renewed on or about February 22, 1995. The renewal request was made on two forms, for the respective two-year renewal periods for which it was delinquent.

The form for the 1992/1994 renewal period, submitted on or about February 22, 1995, contains a statement signed under penalty of perjury claiming the completion of 82 hours of continuing education courses (which would have been performed during the preceding two years, that is, during the Dec. 1990 - Nov. 1992 period).

In or about January 1995, the licensee requested and received an extension for the completion of the continuing education requirements for the 1994/1996 renewal period. The extension was granted until May 31, 1995, subject to the licensee's submission of her renewal application and fee.

On or about February 22, 1995, the licensee submitted the form for the 1994/1996 renewal period, with no indication regarding continuing education. The Board's files reflect that the licensee failed to submit the completed Extension Compliance

Form evidencing completion of the required 80 hours by June 10, 1995. The extension granted pursuant to Board Rule 90 expired May 31, 1995. The licensee has failed to perfect the license renewal, either "with ce³/" or "without ce."

The second second

10. On or about July 30, 1996, complainant Carol B. Sigmann, in her official capacity as Executive Officer of the Board, filed Accusation No. AC-96-10 against Mary M. Leal ("respondent"). A copy of the Accusation is attached hereto as Exhibit A and incorporated herein.

employee of the Office of the Attorney General, sent by certified mail a copy of Accusation No. AC-96-10, Statement to Respondent, Government Code sections 11507.5, 11507.6, and 11507.7, the Notice of Defense form, and a Request for Discovery, to respondent's address of record with the Board which was and is P.O. Box 20068, San Jose, CA 95160. In or about August 1996, the green Domestic Return Receipt was returned to the Office of the Attorney General by the U.S. Postal Service. The receipt appears to have been signed by the respondent in Box 6 marked "Signature (Addressee or Agent)." The above-described service was effective as a matter of law pursuant to the provisions of California Government Code section 11505, subdivision (c).

12. Respondent failed to file a Notice of Defense within 15 days after service upon her of the Accusation and therefore waived her right to a hearing on the merits of

^{3.} CE is an abbreviation for prescribed continuing education.

Accusation No. AC-96-10.

1

2

13

14

15

16

17

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

Audit. Respondent's performance of an audit for Mariners' Plaza 3 Office Condominium Association ("Mariners'") as of December 31, 4 1994 and 1993 and issuance of an unqualified audit opinion on 5 Mariners' financial statements contained extreme departures from 6 the standard of practice of public accountancy, including, but 7 not limited to, failures in properly planning, and in documenting 8 planning of, the audit (AU §§ 150.02; 311.03; 339.05); failure to 9 obtain/document understanding of internal control structure and 10 the assessed level of control risk (AU §§ 319.26 & .39.); 11 failure to obtain sufficient competent evidential matter (AU §§ 12

Mariners' Plaza Office Condominium Association

planning and overall review stages of the audit (AU § 329.01-.04.); failure to obtain and include in working papers a

150.02; 339.05.); failure to perform analytical procedures in the

representation letter from management and an inquiry of client's

lawyer concerning litigation, claims, and assessments (AU §§

333.01, 337.04-.05.); and failure to exercise due professional

19 | care (230.01-.04.).

14. In connection with the Mariners' audit, respondent failed to issue a report which conforms to professional standards upon completion of an audit of financial statements (failed to present required GAAP note disclosures--Audit Guide for CIRA, §§ 4.05-4.22 and 4.30).

15. 58 El Camino Condominium Association.

Respondent's performance of an audit for 58 El Camino Condominium Association ("El Camino") as of December 31, 1994 and 1993,

contained extreme departures from the standard of practice of public accountancy, including, but not limited to, failures in properly planning, and documenting planning of, the audit (AU §§ 150.02; 311.03; 339.05); failure to obtain/document understanding of internal control structure and the assessed level of control risk (AU §§ 319.26 & .39.); failure to obtain sufficient competent evidential matter (AU §§ 150.02; 339.05.); failure to perform analytical procedures in the planning and overall review stages of the audit (AU § 329.01-.04.); failure to obtain and include in her working papers a representation letter from management (AU § 333.01.); failure to obtain and include in her working papers an inquiry of client's lawyer (AU § 337.04-.05.); and failure to exercise due professional care (230.01-.04.).

. .

16. In connection with the El Camino audit, respondent failed to issue a report which conforms to professional standards upon completion of an audit of financial statements (failed to present required GAAP note disclosures--Audit Guide for CIRA, §§ 4.05-4.22 and 4.30).

17. Continuing Education - 1992/1994. Respondent, in renewing her license for the period 1992/1994 in February 1995, signed a statement under penalty of perjury on February 21, 1995, that she had completed 82 hours for the renewal period ended and that she would maintain verification records related thereto for a period of four years, whereas, in truth and in fact, she failed to maintain the required records, and is unable to recall actually completing the required continuing education.

18. Continuing Education - 1994/1996. Respondent

failed to complete 80 hours of applicable continuing education for her 1994/1996 renewal period, having been granted an extension (from December 1, 1994 to May 31, 1995) to do so.

California (March 1980)

*: ** ***

19. Failure to Provide Information to Board. In 1988/89, respondent was selected to submit an audit report and financial statements for review under the provisions of Board Rule 89.1. As a follow-up to that process, which found deficiencies in respondent's submissions and rated them "Substandard," the respondent was requested to submit the subsequent year's financial report.

During the period of time from December 12, 1989 through April 30, 1991, respondent was notified in writing on five separate occasions to submit the subsequent year's audit report and financial statements for review, and no response was forthcoming from the licensee until April 30, 1991. After finding the submissions "Marginal," sixteen hours of continuing education related to financial statement disclosures were recommended.

Respondent was again requested, beginning in August 1992, and continuing until April 1993, to submit another audit report and financial statements for review. No response was received by the Board to its two written notices to the respondent.

20. <u>Unauthorized Practice</u>. During the period of time from December 1, 1992 to February 22, 1995, respondent practiced public accountancy within the meaning of section 5051 during a period of time when her license was expired, on occasions known

to respondent but unknown to the complainant, except that the complainant is aware of the two audit reports referenced herein, which were issued in April 1994.

.

21. Finding of Board Costs. At the time of this decision, the Board's costs of investigation and prosecution, with reference to cost recovery under section 5107, in this case are \$______.

DETERMINATION OF ISSUES

- 1. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to section 5100 of the California Business and Professions Code as established in the jurisdictional findings in paragraphs numbers 9 through 12, above.
- 2. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to section 5100(c) of the California Business and Professions Code on the grounds of gross negligence by reason of the Findings of Fact numbers 13 through 16, in that, with respect to both of the named audits and with respect to each of them, respondent's conduct constitutes an extreme departure from the standard of practice, and cause for revocation has thereby been established, separately and severally.
- 3. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to sections 5100 and 5062 of the California Business and Professions Code on the grounds of unprofessional conduct by reason of the Findings of Fact numbers 14 and 16 because of her failure to observe professional standards with respect to the issuance of each of the subject audit reports, and cause for revocation of respondent's license has thereby been established,

separately and severally.

1.0

4. Respondent has engaged in unprofessional conduct under section 5100(f) of the California Business and Professions Code in conjunction with Board Rule 89(b) for her failure to maintain and make available her continuing education records for the 1992/1994 period by reason of the Findings of Fact numbers 17 above, and cause for revocation has been established.

* * **

- 5. Respondent has engaged in unprofessional conduct under section 5100(f) of the California Business and Professions Code in conjunction with Board Rule 87(a), 89(a) and 89(f) in that she made a false statement in her license renewal for the 1992/1994 renewal period, by reason of the Findings of Fact numbers 9 and 17, above, and cause for revocation has thereby been established.
- 6. Respondent has engaged in unprofessional conduct under section 5100(f) of the California Business and Professions Code in conjunction with Board Rule 89.1(a) and (b) for failure to respond to the Board as set forth in Finding of Fact number 19, above, and cause for revocation has thereby been established.
- 7. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to Board Rule 90(a) and (c) in conjunction with section 5100(f) of the California Business and Professions Code for the willful violation of a Board Rule, by failing to complete her continuing education during the extension granted as set forth in Finding of Fact number 18, and cause for revocation has thereby been established.
 - 8. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action

03541110SF95AD1320 Case No. AC-96-10 Default Decision pursuant to Board Rule 87(a) in conjunction with sections 5050, 5051 and 5100(f) of the California Business and Professions Code for the unauthorized practice of public accountancy, by reason of the Findings of Fact numbers 9, 18 and 20, and cause for revocation has thereby been established. ORDER OF THE BOARD OF ACCOUNTANCY Certified Public Accountant Certificate number CPA 35852, heretofore issued to respondent Mary M. Leal, is hereby revoked. An effective date of November 4th , 1996, has been assigned to this Order. Pursuant to California Government Code section 11520, subdivision (b), respondent is entitled to make any showing by way of mitigation; however, such showing must be made in writing to the Board of Accountancy, 2000 Evergreen Street, Suite 250, Sacramento, California 95815, prior to the effective date of this decision. Made this 4th day of October

1996.

Board of Accountancy

Robert J. Shackleton, President

Department of Consumer Affairs

18

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

C:\JEANNE\LEAL.DEF

(9/4/96)

24

25

26

2.7

03541110SF95AD1320 Case No. AC-96-10 Default Decision

1	DANIEL E. LUNGREN, Attorney General of the State of California		
2	JEANNE COLLETTE WERNER Deputy Attorney General, State Bar No. 93170		
3	Department of Justice 2101 Webster Street, 12th Floor Oakland, California 94612-3049 Telephone: (510) 286-3787		
4			
5	Attorneys for Complainant		
6			
7	BEFORE THE		
8	BOARD OF ACCOUNTANCY DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS		
9	STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
10			
11	In the Matter of the Accusation) NO. AC-96-10 Against:		
12) ACCUSATION MARY M. LEAL)		
13	P. O. Box 20068) San Jose, CA 95160)		
14	Certified Public Accountant)		
15	Certificate No. 35852)		
16	Respondent.)		
17			
18	Complainant Carol Sigmann, as cause for disciplinary		
19	action, alleges:		
20	1. Complainant is the Executive Officer of the		
21	California Board of Accountancy ("Board") and makes and files		
22	this accusation solely in her official capacity.		
23	LICENSE INFORMATION		
24	2. On or about September 24, 1982, Certified Public		
25	Accountant Certificate No. 35852 was issued by the Board to Mary		
26	M. Leal ("respondent"). The certificate expired on December 1,		
27	1992, and remained expired until it was renewed on or about		

February 22, 1995. The renewal request was made on two forms, for the respective two-year renewal periods for which it was delinquent.

A 46 --

The second of the second

The form for the 1992/1994 renewal period, submitted on or about February 22, 1995, contains a statement signed under penalty of perjury claiming the completion of 82 hours of continuing education courses (which would have been performed during the preceding two years, that is, during the December 1990 - November 1992 period) (cf. Bus. & Prof. Code sections 5070.5 and 5070.6).

In or about January 1995, the licensee requested and received an extension for the completion of the continuing education requirements for the 1994/1996 renewal period. The extension was granted until May 31, 1995, subject to the licensee's submission of her renewal application and fee.

The licensee submitted, on or about February 22, 1995, the form for the 1994/1996 renewal period, with no indication regarding continuing education. The Board's files reflect that the licensee failed to submit the completed Extension Compliance Form evidencing completion of the required 80 hours by June 10, 1995. The extension granted pursuant to Rule 90 expired May 31, 1995. Thereafter, the license continued in an "inactive" status, that is, renewed without continuing education, and will expire on November 30, 1996.

STATUTES AND REGULATIONS

3. At all times material herein, **section 5100** of the California Business and Professions Code (hereinafter "Code") has

provided in pertinent part that "(a)fter notice and hearing, the Board may revoke, suspend or refuse to renew any permit or certificate" issued by the Board for unprofessional conduct, including but not limited to:

* * ***

- 5100 (c) Dishonesty, fraud, or gross negligence in the practice of public accountancy.
- 5100 (f) Willful violation of the Accountancy Act or any rule or regulation promulgated by the Board.
- 4. Code section 5050 provides in pertinent part that "(n)o person shall engage in the practice of public accountancy in this State unless such person is the holder of a valid permit to practice public accountancy..." and the practice of public accountancy is defined in Code section 5051. Further, Code section 5055 prohibits a person from assuming or using the title "certified public accountant" or the abbreviation "CPA" unless that person has received from the Board a certified public accountant certificate and holds a valid permit to practice under the provisions of Chapter 1, Division 3, of the Code.
- 5. The Board's regulations, codified in Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations¹, require, in section 87(a) that a licensee complete at least 80 hours of qualifying continuing education during every two-year period immediately preceding permit renewal.
- 6. Board Rule 89(a) requires that a licensee submit, with a license renewal, a written statement, signed under penalty

^{1.} The Board's rules, codified at Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations in Sections 1-99, are hereinafter referred to as "Board Rule." Thus, Section 89 is Board Rule 89.

of perjury attesting to the completion of the requisite number of continuing education hours.

Board Rule 89(b) requires that a licensee, in order to receive continuing education credit for attending a continuing education course, obtain and retain for four years after renewal a certificate of completion or its equivalent signed by the course provider, disclosing required information set forth in the rule.

Board Rule 89(f) provides, with regard to continuing education, that a licensee's willful making of any false or misleading statement, in writing regarding his or her continuing education shall constitute cause for disciplinary action pursuant to Code section 5100(f) of the Accountancy Act.

7. Board Rule 89.1(a) provides that the Board may request licensees, selected on the basis of a statistical sampling, to supply copies of selected financial reports issued during the previous two years.

Board Rule 89.1(b) provides that the willful failure of a licensee to comply with the Board's written request for a copy of financial report(s), within 30 calendar days of the licensee's receipt of that request, constitutes a violation of Code section 5100(f) of the Accountancy Act.

8. Board Rule 90(a) provides that a renewal applicant may be granted either an extension of time to complete continuing education requirements or an exception from continuing education requirements, for the causes stated therein.

Board Rule 90(c) provides that the willful failure of a

licensee to complete applicable continuing education within a specified extension of time shall constitute cause for disciplinary action pursuant to Code section 5100(f) of the Accountancy Act.

* *=

9. Applicable standards of practice pertinent to this accusation include, without limitation:

Comment of the Commen

- A. Generally Accepted Auditing Standards ("GAAS"), which standards are discussed, as relevant herein, in the Statements on Auditing Standards ("SAS") codified by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA). The statements are codified by AU number. The sections pertinent herein include, without limitation: AU § 150.02; AU § 230 (230.01-.04); AU § 311.03; AU §§ 319.26 & 319.39; AU §§ 329.01 329.04; AU § 333.01; AU §§ 337.04 337.05; and AU § 339.05.
- B. Industry audit and accounting standards which are discussed in the Audit and Accounting Guide for Common Interest Realty Associations (AAG-CIR) issued by the AICPA. The sections pertinent herein include, without limitation, AAG-CIR §§ 4.30-4.31 and 7.40.
- Board of all reasonable costs of investigation and prosecution of the case, including, but not limited to, attorney's fees in specified disciplinary actions, including alleged violations of Code section 5100(c). A certified copy of the actual costs, or a good faith estimate of costs signed by the Executive Officer, constitute prima facie evidence of reasonable costs of investigation and prosecution of the case.

1 exp 3 by 4 re 5 it 6 ag 7 an 8 di 9 Cc 10 re 11 cc 12 13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

11. Pursuant to Code section 118(b), the suspension, expiration, or forfeiture by operation of law of a license issued by the Board shall not during any period within which it may be renewed, restored, reissued or reinstated, deprive the Board of its authority to institute or continue a disciplinary proceeding against the licensee upon any ground provided by law or to enter an order suspending or revoking the license or otherwise taking disciplinary action against the licensee on any such ground. Code section 5070.6 provides that an expired permit may be renewed at any time within five years after its expiration upon compliance with certain requirements.

* * -

FOR CAUSES FOR DISCIPLINE

Mariners' Plaza Office Condominium Association Audit

- Office Condominium Association ("Mariners'") as of December 31, 1994 and 1993 and issued an unqualified audit opinion on Mariners' financial statements. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Code section 5100 because the audit she performed contained departures from the standard of practice of public accountancy, including, but not limited to, the following:
- A. The auditor failed to plan the audit, and/or failed to document any planning of the audit, by failing to plan or to include in her documentation an audit program and her knowledge of the entity's business; her planned assessment of control risk; and/or her preliminary judgments about materiality levels. (Reference AU § 150.02; AU § 311.03; AU § 339.05.)
 - B. The auditor failed to obtain, and/or failed to

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

26

27

document in her work papers, her understanding of internal control structure and the assessed level of control risk. (Reference AU § 319.26; AU § 319.39.)

- The auditor failed to obtain sufficient competent evidential matter to afford a reasonable basis for an opinion regarding the financial statements under audit. The workpapers reveal virtually no evidence that any of the client-prepared trial balances were audited. (Reference AU § 150.02; AU § 339.05.)
- The auditor failed to perform analytical D. procedures in the planning and overall review stages of her (Reference AU § 329.01-.04.) audit.
- The auditor failed to obtain and include in her Ε. working papers a representation letter from management. (Reference AU § 333.01.)
- The auditor failed to obtain and include in her F. working papers an inquiry of client's lawyer concerning litigation, claims, and assessments. (Reference AU § 337.04-.05.)
- The auditor failed to exercise due professional care in that she did not meet the three standards of field work that require planning; an understanding of internal control; and sufficient competent evidential matter. (Reference AU § 230.01-.04.)
- The auditor failed to modify the report for Η. deficiencies in the financial statement presentation and disclosure, in that the financial statements do not present unaudited supplemental information required by AAG-CIR

3

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27

Incorporating by reference the facts alleged in paragraph 12 above, cause for discipline exists because respondent was grossly negligent in her performance of the audit in violation of Code section 5100(c) in that the deficiencies constitute an extreme departure from applicable standards.

2 3 m

Incorporating by reference the facts alleged in paragraph 12, subparagraph H above, cause for discipline exists insofar as said conduct violates Code section 5062, in that respondent failed to issue a report which conforms to professional standards upon completion of an audit of financial statements.

58 El Camino Condominium Association

- Respondent performed an audit for 58 El Camino Condominium Association ("El Camino") as of December 31, 1994 and 1993. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Code section 5100 because the audit she performed contained departures from applicable standards, including, but not limited to, the following:
- The auditor failed to plan the audit, and/or failed to document any planning of the audit, by failing to plan or to include in her documentation an audit program and her knowledge of the entity's business; her planned assessment of control risk; and/or her preliminary judgments about materiality (Reference AU § 150.02; AU § 311.03; AU § 339.05.)
- The auditor failed to obtain, and/or failed to document in her work papers, her understanding of internal

- C. The auditor failed to obtain sufficient competent

 evidential matter to afford a reasonable basis for an opinion

 regarding the financial statements under audit. The workpapers

 reveal virtually no evidence that any of the client-prepared

 trial balances were audited. (Reference AU § 150.02; AU §

 339.05.)
 - D. The auditor failed to perform analytical procedures in the planning and overall review stages of her audit. (Reference AU § 329.01-.04.)
 - E. The auditor failed to obtain and include in her working papers a representation letter from management.

 (Reference AU § 333.01.)
 - F. The auditor failed to obtain and include in her working papers an inquiry of client's lawyer concerning litigation, claims, and assessments. (Reference AU § 337.04-.05.)
 - G. The auditor failed to exercise due professional care in that she did not meet the three standards of field work that require planning; an understanding of internal control; and sufficient competent evidential matter. (Reference AU § 230.01-.04.)
 - H. The auditor **failed to modify the report** for deficiencies in the financial statement presentation and disclosure, in that the financial statements do not present unaudited supplemental information required by AAG-CIR §§ 4.30-4.31 and 7.40.

16. Incorporating by reference the facts alleged in paragraph 15 above, cause for discipline exists because respondent was grossly negligent in her performance of the audit in violation of Code section 5100(c) in that the deficiencies constitute an extreme departure from applicable standards.

W & wan

17. Incorporating by reference the facts alleged in paragraph 15, subparagraph H above, cause for discipline exists insofar as said conduct violates Code section 5062, in that respondent failed to issue a report which conforms to professional standards upon completion of an audit of financial statements.

FOR FURTHER CAUSES FOR DISCIPLINE Continuing Education - 1992/1994

- 18. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to Code section 5100(f) in conjunction with Board Rules 87 and 89 in that she renewed her license for the period 1992/1994 in February 1995, accompanied by a statement signed under penalty of perjury on February 21, 1995, that she had completed 82 hours for the renewal period ended and that she would maintain verification records related thereto for a period of four years.
- 19. Incorporating by reference the allegations in paragraph 18, respondent has subjected her certificate to disciplinary action pursuant to Code section 5100(f) in conjunction with Board Rule 89(b) in that she failed to maintain the required records in violation of said rule.
 - 20. Incorporating by reference the allegations in

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

paragraph 18, respondent has subjected her certificate to disciplinary action pursuant to Code section 5100(f) in conjunction with Board Rule 89(f) in that she made a false statement regarding her continuing education by promising to maintain said records and failing to do so.

· .

Continuing Education - 1994/1996

Incorporating by reference the matters alleged in paragraph 2 above, respondent is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to Code section 5100(f) in conjunction with Board Rule 90(c) in that she failed to complete 80 hours of applicable continuing education for her 1994/1996 renewal period, having been granted an extension (from December 1, 1994 to May 31, 1995) to do so.

Failure to Provide Information to Board

In 1988/89, respondent was selected to submit an audit report and financial statements for review under the provisions of Board Rule 89.1. As a follow-up to that process, which found deficiencies in respondent's submissions and rated them "Substandard," the respondent was requested to submit the subsequent year's financial report.

During the period December 12, 1989 through April 30, 1991, respondent was notified in writing on five separate occasions to submit the subsequent year's audit report and financial statements for review. No response was forthcoming from the licensee until April 30, 1991. This review found the submissions "Marginal." Sixteen hours of continuing education related to financial statement disclosures were recommended.

Respondent was again requested, beginning in August 1992, and continuing until April 1993, to submit another audit report and financial statements for review. No response was received by the Board to its two written notices to the respondent.

* * =

23. Incorporating by reference the matters alleged in paragraph 22 above, respondent is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to Code section 5100(f) in conjunction with Board Rule 89.1 in that she failed to respond to the Board's two written requests, between August 1992 and April 1993, for her to submit an audit report and financial statements for review pursuant to Board Rule 89.1.

Unauthorized Practice

24. Incorporating by reference the allegations in paragraphs 2, 12 and 15, respondent has subjected her certificate to disciplinary action pursuant to Code section 5050 in conjunction with Code sections 5051, 5055 and 5100(f) in that, during the period of time from December 1, 1992 to February 22, 1995, respondent practiced accountancy within the meaning of Code section 5051 during a period of time when her license was expired, on occasions known to respondent but unknown to the complainant, except that the complainant is aware of the audit reports referenced in paragraphs 12 and 15, which were issued in April 1994.

25. Incorporating by reference the matters alleged in paragraph 24, cause for discipline of respondent's certificate exists pursuant to Code section 5100(f) in conjunction with Board

Rule 87(a), which requires that a licensee shall not engage in public practice unless the licensee has completed the required continuing education and submitted the required statement attesting thereto. OTHER MATTERS Pursuant to Code section 5107, it is requested 26. that the administrative law judge, as part of the proposed decision in this proceeding, direct respondent to pay to the Board all reasonable costs of investigation and prosecution in this case, including, but not limited to, attorneys' fees. PRAYER WHEREFORE, complainant requests that the Board hold a hearing on the matters alleged herein, and that following said hearing, the Board issue a decision: Revoking or suspending Certified Public Accountant 1. Certificate Number 35852, heretofore issued to respondent Mary M. Leal; Awarding the Board costs as provided by statute; 2. and Taking such other and further action as the Board 3. deems proper. DATED: Board of Accountancy Department of Consumer Affairs State of California

2 3 5

JCW:pam (7/30/96)

03541110-SF95AD1320 No. AC-96-10 Accusation 1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

Complainant